

Remarks

This Reply is in response to the Final Office Action mailed February 8, 2008.

Summary of Applicant's Amendments

The present reply amends Claims 1-2, 4-5, 8-9, 12, 15, 18, 22, and 25, leaving for Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-2, 4-20, and 22-27.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 8-9 were objected to for use of 'capable of'. Claims 1 and 8 were objected to for use of 'automatically repairing'. Accordingly, Claims 1-2, 4-5, and 8-9 have been amended as shown above. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101

Claims 1-2 and 4-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 for being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 8 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 1 and 8, as amended, Claims 2 and 4-7, which depend from Claim 1, and Claims 9-14, which depend from Claim 8, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2, 12, and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, Claims 2, 12, and 18 have been amended as shown above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 12, and 18 conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action mailed February 08, 2008, Claims 1, 4-20, and 22-27 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over WebLogic Server 6.1: Developing Weblogic Server J2EE Applications (hereafter the Weblogic reference). Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Weblogic reference in view of Reddy, et al. (U.S.

Patent Number 5,845,120, hereafter Reddy).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define that “the system is operable to automatically generate a replacement deployment descriptor based on at least one application source code file associated with the at least one deployment descriptor if the at least one deployment descriptor is defective.” Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is not disclosed or made obvious by the cited references.

The Weblogic reference discloses that a user can validate changes made to a deployment descriptor by clicking validate. (Step 10, page 17). The Weblogic reference also discloses manually deleting elements from a deployment descriptor. (Step 8, page 17). Applicant respectfully submits, however, that the Weblogic reference does not disclose or make obvious automatically generating a replacement deployment descriptor *based on at least one application source code file* associated with if the at least one deployment descriptor is defective.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 8, 15, and 22

Claim 8 has been amended to more clearly define “a generator operable to create a second representation of *the* at least one deployment descriptor based on *at least one application source code file associated with the at least one deployment descriptor*.” Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is not disclosed in or made obvious by the cited references.

Claim 8 has also been amended to more clearly define that the builder is further operable to update the first representation “if the at least one application source code file of the second representation is modified.” Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is not disclosed in or made obvious by the cited references.

The Weblogic reference discloses that a user can edit, delete, or add elements in the deployment descriptors by navigating the tree and clicking on parent elements until the user finds the element he wants to modify. (Steps 5-8, pages 15-16). After making the desired changes, the user can validate the changes, by clicking validate, and write the changes to the deployment

descriptor to disk by clicking persist. (Steps 10-11, page 16).

The Weblogic reference appears to disclose a method for manually editing deployment descriptor files. By contrast, the embodiment of Claim 8 defines a first representation based on the deployment descriptor's file and a second representation based on at least one application source code file. A builder updates the first representation based on the second representation if changes are made to the application source code file. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed in or made obvious by the cited references.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 8, as currently amended, is neither anticipated by nor obvious in view of the cited references and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 15, and 22 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiments therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 8, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 15, and 22, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-5, 6-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 23-27

The embodiment of Claim 5 includes a builder component operable to automatically update the at least one deployment descriptor to reflect one or more changes in the at least one application source code file. Applicant respectfully submits that the Weblogic reference does not disclose or make obvious this feature. Instead, the Weblogic reference discloses that the user must explicitly click the Persist button to write changes *made to the deployment descriptors* using the editor to the disk.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 23-27 are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the additional features of these claims. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 2, 4-7, 9-14, 16-20, and 23-27 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to

telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 1, 2008

By: /Nathan L. Feld/
Nathan L. Feld
Reg. No. 59,725

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800